



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/597,047

07/10/2006

Wilhelmus Josephus Bronnenberg

NL040009

5252

24737

7590

04/13/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

JOHN, CLARENCE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2443

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/13/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/597,047	Applicant(s) BRONNENBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner CLARENCE JOHN	Art Unit 2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed on January 14, 2009 where the applicant amended claims 1 and 11. Claims 1-11 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on January 14, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and do not place the Application in condition for allowance.
3. With respect to Claim 1 and 11, the Applicant argues that the prior arts of record fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant's invention, such as "periodically filtering said information by removing information about content, which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for rendering content" and "storing said information filtered in a content directory and making said information stored available on the network".
4. **In reply**, The Examiner disagrees and states that with respect to Claim 1 and 11, the combination of Theriault and Hughes do teach the above limitations.

Theriault teaches filtering said information by removing information about content (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17) which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for rendering content (Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information). Theriault also

Art Unit: 2443

teaches storing said filtered information in a content directory and making said stored information available on the network. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system). However, Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering. Conversely, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-39, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information.

5. Examiner notes that no new matter has been added and that the amended claims are rejected based on the references as cited by the previous office action.
6. Applicant has failed to clearly point out patentable novelty in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited that would overcome the 103(a) rejections applied against the claims, the rejection is therefore sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Deleted: ¶

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2443

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault et al. (US 6,049,821) in view of Hughes et al. (US 6,065,055).
8. With respect to Claim 1, Theriault teaches a method of filtering and storing information about content, which is available on a network device in a network, wherein said network further comprises network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprises the steps of: -
9. filtering said information by removing information about content (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17) which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for rendering content, (Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information); storing said filtered information in a content directory and making said stored information available on the network. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).
10. Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.
11. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is

Art Unit: 2443

the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).

12. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by modifying the teaching of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

13. With respect to Claim 5, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitation as described in Claim 1 above.

14. However, Theriault does not explicitly state about teaching filtering and storing information of content "in predefined time intervals".

15. Conversely, Hughes does in fact teach such a limitation. (Figure 10, Scan Interval of 5 minutes, Column 5, lines 10-12).

16. See the above discussion in Claim 1.

17. With respect to Claim 6, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to claim 1, wherein said method of filtering and storing information about content is performed when a new network rendering device enters the network. (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17. Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-

58. Here, the user device selecting the filtering services is the new device entering the network).

18. With respect to Claim 10, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to claim 1, wherein the method further comprises storing said removed information about content, (Theriault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58, That is, storing of the modified response i.e., removed information in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

19. which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for rendering content (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and making said stored information available on the network. (Theriault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

20. With respect to Claim 11, Theriault and Hughes teach a filtering device adapted for filtering and storing information about content, which is available on a network device in a network, wherein said network further comprises network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the network device further comprises:

21. means for filtering said information by removing information about content, (Theriault's teachings on content (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17) ;

22. which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for rendering content, (Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);
23. means for storing said filtered information in a content directory and making said stored information available on the network. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).
24. Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.
25. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the information).
26. However, Hughes teaches such a limitation.
27. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by

modifying the teaching of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

28. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

29. over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Abdulrahiman et al. (US 2003/0023671)

30. With respect to Claim 2, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 1. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein content, which cannot be rendered by a network rendering device comprises content having a content format. (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17; Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);

31. However Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

32. Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices. Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5).

33. Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahiman by modifying the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

34. With respect to Claim 3, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 1. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein content, which cannot be rendered by a network rendering device comprises content. (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17; Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information);

35. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content having a transport protocol, which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

36. Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices
Abdulrahiman also teaches about a content having a transport protocol. (Page 3, paragraph [0030], lines 6-11, Paragraph [0031], lines 5-8. That is, electronic

information transmitted between remote source and proxy via wireless / wire connection must have a transport protocol).

37. Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Abdulrahiman with Theriault and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

38. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

39. With respect to Claim 4, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 1.

40. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a method according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.

41. Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital Rights Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2, paragraph [0021, lines 1-2).

42. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. It would

Art Unit: 2443

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Safadi with Theriault, and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy protection of content.

43. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Gorman (US 2002/0143780).

44. With respect to Claim 7, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 1. Theriault also teaches a method of filtering (Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and storing information about content is performed (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

45. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network.

46. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

47. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices.

48. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Theriault and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

49. With respect to Claim 8, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 1. Also, Theriault and Hughes teach a method of filtering (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and storing information about content is performed (Theriault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58); for a predefined time interval (Hughes teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval, Column 5, lines 10-12).

50. However Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about filtering which is performed when a network device has been removed.

51. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

52. See the above discussion in Claim 7.

53. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Cheng (US 2002/0078161).

54. With respect to Claim 9, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 1. Theriault also teaches the information about content being available on a network device is the content information stored by the content directory service. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

55. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings wherein the network is a UPnP network.

56. Cheng teaches about network communication over server and devices in a UPnP network. (Page 2, paragraph [0018], lines 1-5. Figure 1).

57. Theriault and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices over a network. Cheng teaches about network communication in a UPnP network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Cheng with Theriault, Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by employing a UPnP network which is self configuring and has the network controller which is capable of discovering and controlling other devices.

Conclusion

The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and /or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification. For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required to cite its corresponding support in the specification.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2443

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2443
4/9/2009

/Tonia LM Dollinger/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443